UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,450	06/23/2003	John Francis Marentette	2003P09046US; 60,427-611	9773
24500 7590 03/22/2007 SIEMENS CORPORATION EXAMINER				
	AL PROPERTY LAW	MILLER, CARL STUART		
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3747	
			•	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	NTHS	03/22/2007	PAI	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/601,450	MARENTETTE, JOHN FRANCIS				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	·	Carl S. Miller	3747				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status	•						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 J	lanuary 2007		•			
		s action is non-final.					
3)	,_						
٠,٥	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4) 🖂	4) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-6,9-13 and 15-17</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>12,13,15 and 17</u> is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-2, 4-6, 9-10 and 16</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.						
· -	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
		- · ·	• •	FR 1 121(d)			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
_	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
. * &	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notic 3) Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atont ripphoation				

Application/Control Number: 10/601,450

Art Unit: 3747

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-10, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazaki in view of JP ('613)

Miyazaki applies as noted in the rejection of Claims 6 and 9 in the last office action and JP('613) teaches locating the expandable member in the intake plenum with a spring-like bellows between the member and the plenum. Note that locating a spring within the enclosure, as opposed to being part of the enclosure, has already been taught by Miyazaki.

It would have been obvious to locate the spring device and enclosure within the plenum as taught by JP('613) because this device also reduced the volume of a plenum for a similar purpose as the device of Miyazaki.

Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 12, 13, 15 and 17 are allowed.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/09/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. First of all, the applicant should note that Webster's defines a plenum as any enclosure that "contains air or other gas at a pressure greater than that of the air or gas outside the enclosure." By this definition the air intake of Miyazaki clearly acts as a

plenum. Secondly, the bellows of Miyazaki acts to restrict the flow of air through the plenum by decreasing the cross-section of the flow path through compression of a spring-loaded bellows. Japan ('613) teaches that it was known in the art to decrease the cross-section of an intake plenum by locating a spring-loaded bellows within the plenum. While the decrease in Japan is related to engine speed and the one in Miyazaki dependent upon load, both decreases are related to engine parameters and the Japan teaching is only being used to show that it was known to achieve a similar reduction in volume by mounting the bellows inside the plenum. Thus, the examiner continues to believe that it would have been obvious to achieve the Miyazaki result by simply mounting a bellows within the plenum. Finally, it should be noted that Miyazaki does teach an embodiment (Figure 3) wherein the spring-loaded device is within the plenum.

The examiner notes that Claim 10 may need to be reworded in that, although the term "differential pressure" is not clearly defined, the expansion of the deformable member may be the result of a lower differential pressure not a "higher" one as the claim states. This is because the spring in the application is in tension and not compression as is the one in Miyazaki.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl S. Miller whose telephone number is 571-272-4849. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWTHF.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Cronin, can be reached on 571-272-4536. The phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Printery Evanuater